

Subject: Re: CPRA re City Attorney's Twitter account
From: Strefan Fauble <strefan.fauble@lacity.org>
Date: 3/3/19, 2:51 PM
To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

There are currently no muted accounts. As to a list of any such accounts being exempt under the CPRA, while I will not provide you with a full legal analysis, please see *Times Mirror v. Superior Ct.* (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1325, which holds that appointment calendars, phone records, and other factual records may be deliberative process privileged and exempt from production under the CPRA because they reveal the thought processes of government decision makers. Revealing a user's list of muted accounts effectively reveals the user-decision maker's priorities and his choices of what to consider or not in his decision making process. And, as Government Code section 3524(j) concerning library circulation records implicitly indicates, a user's choice of reading priorities and habits is personal information subject to exemption. Thus, lists of muted accounts would be exempt under Gov. Code sections 6254(c) and (k).

-Strefan Fauble

On Thu, Feb 21, 2019 at 3:12 PM Westlake Investigations
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Feuer,

Can you state whether there are in fact muted accounts that you're refusing to produce or are you stating a hypo or are you going full Glomar?

Also, can you explain how a list of facts can be deliberative process? Can you state the decision that this list is predecisional with respect to?

Finally, can you explain how Twitter handles could be personal private information give that their creators have published them to the world already?

In short, can you please abandon this claim that a list of accounts muted by the City Attorney is exempt under any theory and just produce the information?

Thanks!

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: Strefan Fauble <strefan.fauble@lacity.org>

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:26 PM

[REDACTED]
Subject: CPRA re City Attorney's Twitter account
[REDACTED]